

Misrepresentation

Has been the one weapon which the enemies of good water for Tulsa have wielded tirelessly, relentlessly, savagely, unscrupulously—desperately in an attempt to prevent Tulsa going to the Spavinaw river for a permanent, plenteous supply of pure water.

No trickery, no falsehood, has been too low for those who are placing private greed above public good to stoop to—providing they thought it could cloud the issue and bring about defeat of the water bonds. One by one the camouflage has been stripped from their lies and they stand convicted of treason to the city of Tulsa.

They said Shell creek could supply Tulsa with a sufficiency of water but still maintain that Spavinaw is insufficient.

Yet Shell creek has a drainage area of less than 28 square miles and a maximum average rainfall of 36 inches, while the Spavinaw has a drainage of 402 square miles and an average normal rainfall of 44 inches.

They said Shell creek could supply Tulsa with pure water while Spavinaw was contaminated by sulphur springs.

Yet 50 Tulsa high school boys came near losing their lives from typhoid contracted while on a camping trip on Shell creek; chemists have found upon examination that Shell creek water is literally alive with typhoid fever germs, polluted otherwise and wholly unsafe to drink, while every authority, from the state board of health down to the lowly native who has lived along the banks of the Spavinaw for half a century, pronounce the waters of the Spavinaw the purest and best that are to be found anywhere in the entire southwest—far superior to anything else in Oklahoma.

They said the tax rate, in case the Spavinaw water bonds carry, will be confiscatory, will bankrupt the city and rob the laboring man of his home.

Yet it has been proven by indisputable evidence that even with the addition of the amount needed to carry the water bonds, taxes will be less than they are now. Addition of millions of dollars of taxable property and the increased value of many other properties will reduce the present rate. It also has been shown that in five years the city will save more from bottled water, excessive plumbing bills, corroded boilers and other wastage because of impure water, than will be spent in 25 years for the Spavinaw project.

They said Spavinaw water will cost 75 cents per 1,000 gallons.

Yet the cost estimate of the Engineers' club was 12.76 cents per 1,000 gallons on a basis of 10,000,000 gallons a day. The present average rate is 14 cents per 1,000 gallons. Spavinaw water then will be a saving of 1.24 cents on every 1,000 gallons or \$45,000 a year after paying all

costs, including the interest and sinking fund on the bond issue.

They said that the Spavinaw went dry.

Yet 37 residents of the village of Spavinaw who have lived there for periods ranging up to 50 years have signed a statement saying not one of them ever had known the Spavinaw to go dry. No engineer has denied that the Spavinaw will furnish water enough for a city of a quarter of a million population.

They quoted Sam Mays of Pryor as stating that the Spavinaw goes dry and is polluted with salt springs.

Yet it has been developed that this statement was written by a young attorney of Pryor who was paid for his services by opponents of the bond issue.

They sent to St. Louis for one Hiram Phillips, engineer, to come to Tulsa and issue a statement discrediting the report of Henry A. Pressey, upon which Tulsa is voting on the water bond question. They quoted him in outlandish statements intended to discredit the Pressey report.

Yet he admitted he never had checked over the Pressey report, and Mayor Hubbard has made public information that Hiram Phillips was promised \$1,000 by H. Y. McFarland to come to Tulsa and make an adverse report.

They exhibited a sample of sulphur water which they said L. Y. McFarland had dipped from the Spavinaw.

Yet he later admitted it came out of a spring and not out of the river and that it could not possibly affect the taste or quality of the water in the stream.

They say it is folly to go to the Spavinaw for water when it is necessary to cross Grand river, which, they say, is just as good or better and 25 miles nearer.

Yet the Grand river is only three miles nearer at the point where the pipeline crosses and at the airline is only 14 miles nearer. Moreover, the airline is not a practical route for a pipeline on account of the topography, which would necessitate crossing a number of hills and would require more reservoirs and more pumping than the Spavinaw project.

They said the bonds will raise rents.

Yet John O. Mitchell, one of the leading real estate men of the city, has said that he will not raise the rent of a one of his forty tenants and will also pay whatever additional tax may devolve upon his tenants by reason of the bond issue. R. T. Daniel, one of the leading opponents of the bond issue in January, 1919, raised the rent on the Puritan cafe from \$150 to \$200 a month and has informed his tenant that he will not renew the lease for anything less than \$400 after January 1, 1920—and this regardless of whether the bond issue carries. It isn't the bond issue but the greed of landlords of the type of R. T. Daniel that will raise rents.

They said the towns in the Spavinaw area would pollute the stream.

Yet only two of the towns have sewer systems and neither of these empties into the Spavinaw and half of the towns named are mere postoffice stations and have no population.

They said Grand river water is as good as Spavinaw.

Yet Grand river is muddy ten months of the year.

They ridiculed the moving pictures of Spavinaw.

Yet they were afraid to show pictures of Shell creek, although there is a reel of Shell creek pictures in the city today. Neither would they encourage voters to go to see Shell creek, while the Spavinaw boosters took nearly 100 citizens of Tulsa up to Spavinaw and they became Spavinaw boosters.

They chided citizens about their tax payments.

Yet Page refused to show his upon public challenge to do so to learn whether he pays taxes on his property or evades it through the pseudo charitable institution—the Sand Springs home.

They assault the character of men in favor of the bond issue when the issue is whether or not there is sufficient good water at Spavinaw.

They started out to advocate Shell creek, deserted this for Grand river, then came back to the Arkansas, indicating that their purpose is not to get good water for the city but to create a multiplicity of issues to confuse the voter.

Tomorrow is the day they had hoped to realize on their campaign of deceit. You, Mr. Voter, are the one who is to decide whether they have succeeded.

Will you vote "no" on the water bonds, for private greed instead of public good, to throttle Tulsa's life; or will you vote "YES", for good water and a Greater Tulsa?

Remember Tulsa's slogan: "Tulsa Will" and Vote "YES" for the Water Bonds.